

REMARKS

Applicants request reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-15, 20-22, and 26-30 are pending, with claims 1, 8, and 30 being independent. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found throughout the application, for example, at page 9, line 5 through page 11, line 6 referring to FIG. 5. Applicants have amended the specification to include the text presented in originally-filed FIGS. 6A, 6B, 8A, 8B, 10A, 10B, and 14 and have submitted replacement drawing sheets renumbering FIGS. 7, 9, 11-13, 15, and 16 as FIGS. 6-12. Applicants have also made minor formal amendments to the specification in accordance these changes. No new matter has been added.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Hossain and Examiner Kelley for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during a telephone interview on October 25, 2007. During the interview, Examiner Hossain, Examiner Kelley, and Applicants' representative discussed amended independent claim 1 and previously-filed dependent claim 19. Examiner Hossain and Examiner Kelley indicated that further consideration was required with respect to amended independent claim 1 and that dependent claim 19 appeared to recite allowable subject matter. This reply reflects the substance of the interview.

Specification and Drawing Objections

The specification and drawings were objected for various informalities. In this response, Applicants have amended the specification and have submitted replacement drawing sheets merely renumbering FIGS. 7, 9, 11-13, 15, and 16 as FIGS. 6-12. Applicants submit that the amendments to the specification and the submission of new drawing sheets addresses all of the issues raised in the Office Action. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections.

Claim Objections

Claims 5 and 12 were objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended claims 5 and 12. Applicants submit that the amendments to claims 5 and 12 address all of the issues raised in the Office Action. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections.

§ 112 Rejections

Claims 19-21 were rejected as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants have incorporated features of claim 19 into independent claim 8. In doing so, Applicants have modified the features of claim 19. As discussed in the interview of October 25, 2007, Examiner Hossain and Examiner Kelley agreed that the modification to the features of claim 19 would overcome the enablement rejection. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

§ 101 Rejection

Claims 8-16 and 18-22 were rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have cancelled claims 16, 18, and 19 and amended claims 8-15 and 20-22 as recommended by Examiner Hossain and Examiner Kelley during the interview of October 25, 2007. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-7, 26, and 27 were rejected as being unpatentable over Stautner (U.S. Patent No. 6,172,677) in view of Lett (U.S. Patent No. 5,592,551) and Jones (U.S. Patent No. 5,592,551). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections because neither Stautner, Lett, Jones, nor any proper combination of the references, describes or properly suggests all of the features of amended independent claim 1.

For example, amended independent claim 1 recites, inter alia, generating display data corresponding to a listing of shows for presentation as part of an electronic programming guide by searching index data stored in an index data area based on search criteria associated with the listing of shows, and accessing, from the index data stored in the index data area, show information for one or more identified shows. Amended independent claim 1 also recites generating display data corresponding to a show description for presentation as part of the electronic programming guide by searching detail data stored in a detail data area based on search criteria associated with a particular show, and accessing, from the detail data stored in the detail data area, the show description information for the particular show. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Stautner, Lett, Jones, nor any proper combination of the references, describes or properly suggests these features.

Specifically, the Office Action admits that neither Stautner nor Lett disclose preparing data tables having an index data area and a detail data area, separating the stored data into index data and detail data, and loading data to the data tables. Therefore, Stautner and Lett necessarily cannot describe or suggest indexing electronic programming guide data into index data and detail data to enable generation of display data corresponding to a listing of shows by searching and accessing the index data and enable generation of display data corresponding to a show description by searching and accessing the detail data, as recited in amended independent claim 1. The Office Action instead relies on Jones for disclosure of these features.

Jones fails to remedy the deficiencies of Stautner and Lett discussed above. In particular, Jones is directed to transmitting electronic coupons to viewers via a television signal. See Abstract. As shown in Fig. 8, when a processor included in a subscriber unit receives coupon data included in a television signal, the processor stores data in both a coupon identifier section and a coupon information section. See col. 14, lines 20-25. The coupon identifier section stores coupon identifiers and the coupon information section stores coupon information corresponding to coupon identifiers included in the coupon identifier section. See id. To access coupon information, the coupon identifier section further includes pointers identifying the data in the coupon information section that corresponds to the each of the coupon identifiers included in the coupon identifier section. See col. 15 at lines 22-29. Specifically, when a user selects a coupon, the processor retrieves pointers from the coupon identifier section and accesses coupon information from the coupon information section using the pointers. See col. 16, lines 25-30. As such, the system of Jones retrieves data from the coupon information by accessing data from the coupon identifier section. Jones provides no description or suggestion that the two sections of coupon data are separately searchable. Accordingly, the system of Jones does not describe or suggest that the coupon data is indexed into the coupon identifier section and the coupon information section to thereby enable generation of a first type of display data by searching and accessing data the coupon identifier section, which includes less detailed coupon data, and also enable generation of a second, different type of display data by searching and accessing data from the coupon information section, which includes more detailed coupon data.

Therefore, Jones fails to describe or suggest indexing electronic programming guide data into index data and detail data to enable generation of display data corresponding to a listing of

shows by searching and accessing the index data and enable generation of display data corresponding to a show description by searching and accessing the detail data, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 and claims 3-7, 26, and 27 depending therefrom.

Claim 2, which depends from claim 1, was rejected as being unpatentable over Stautner in view of Lett, Jones, and Ellis (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,869). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 at least because Stautner, Lett, and Jones fail to describe or suggest the features of amended independent claim 1 and Ellis fails to remedy the deficiencies of Stautner, Lett, and Jones discussed above.

New claims 28 and 29 depend from independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 28 and 29 are allowable at least for the reason of that dependency.

Claims 8-15 were rejected as being unpatentable over Lett in view of Jones. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections because neither Lett, Jones, nor any proper combination of the two, describes or properly suggests all of the features of amended independent claim 8.

Specifically, independent claim 8 has been amended to include the features of previously-filed dependent claim 19. Dependent claim 19 was not rejected based on prior art grounds in the Office Action and, as discussed in the interview of October 25, 2007, Examiner Hossain and Examiner Kelley agreed that the features of previously-filed dependent claim 19 appear to be allowable. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of rejection of independent claim 8 and claims 9-15 depending therefrom.

Claim 22, which depends from claim 1, was rejected as being unpatentable over Lett in view of Jones and Banker (U.S. Patent No. 5,485,221). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 at least because Lett and Jones fail to describe or suggest the features of amended independent claim 8 and Banker fails to remedy the deficiencies of Lett, and Jones discussed above.

New independent claim 30, although different in scope from claim 8, recites features similar to those recited by independent claim 8. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed

Applicant : Jason Wang et al.
Serial No. : 09/867,578
Filed : May 31, 2001
Page : 29 of 29

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-138001 / AOLTV 13

above with respect to independent claim 8, Applicants respectfully submit that new independent claim 30 is allowable.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, objection, issue, or comment, including the Office Action's characterizations of the art, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the rejected claims in further prosecution of this or related applications.


Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.136, Applicants hereby petition that the period for response be extended for one month to and including October 29, 2007.

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. The fee in the amount of \$120.00 in payment of the one-month extension of time fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/29/2007



Jeremy J. Monaldo
Reg. No. 58,680

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331
40454364.doc